WARTIME GAINS FOR THE AMERICAN FAMILY

BY
JAMES H. TUFTS
PROFESSOR AND HEAD OF DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

HQ535
.T91

HD5535
.T91

HQ535
.T91

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAR 1920
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

WARTIME GAINS FOR THE AMERICAN FAMILY

BY
JAMES H. TUFTS
PROFESSOR AND HEAD OF DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

ADDRESS BEFORE THE
DIVISION ON THE FAMILY OF THE
NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF SOCIAL WORK
JUNE 2, 1919

CHARITY ORGANIZATION DEPARTMENT OF THE
RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION
130 EAST TWENTY-SECOND STREET
NEW YORK CITY
1919

WARTIME GAINS FOR THE AMERICAN FAMILY

WAR and the family have fought a long duel. From the earliest beginnings of history we hear voices and see pictures which typify many of the tragic features of this conflict. For War has not merely taken away son and husband and father from the home; it has sacrificed its Iphigenias to speed the fleet; it has compelled Jephthah's daughters to bewail virginity upon the mountains; it has brought home as spoil, even as Sisera's victorious hosts were expected to bring home, a damsel, two damsels to every man; with Agamemnon and his fellow Greeks, it has robbed fathers and husbands of daughters and wives whom it has taken to the tents and households of haughty victors; it has returned warriors to their Penelopes only to find themselves like Ulysses, restless until they have again set forth "roaming with a hungry heart."

In general, war and militarism have developed the power and assertiveness of the male, and tended to subordinate the woman. Denied his normal family life the warrior has often claimed great license, and has felt impatient at the standards of peace. War has tended to build up aristocracies, and as Sumner puts it, "In aristocratic society a man's family arrangements are his own prerogative." We may perhaps place to its credit some part in establishing the greater permanence and unity of the family which male dominance favored—so long as male dominance was unchallenged. But if we put this to its credit we must also charge it with thereby laying the basis for a long history of struggle against such dominance when democracy began to assert itself, and the pair-marriage ideal, fostered by the middle class and by peace, gained more and more the ascendency.

So firmly, indeed, does our family type seem now to be fixed that it has not merely come through the great upheavals of this war less disturbed directly than the seemingly more powerful institutions of government and property; it has even received a notable tribute from radical sources. So long as Russia was overthrowing her government all Western Europe and America said Amen. When land was redistributed and private property changed hands, radicals at least acclaimed the swift advance of the proletariat. But when there came a report that the Bolsheviki were proposing to replace the private family by a nationalizing of women, there was denunciation not merely by conservatives but by radicals. The proclamation in question was declared to be from the Anarchists and not from the Bolsheviki; then the Anarchists were quick to brand the decree as an invention of their enemies. It does not matter for our purpose whether any group in Russia actually attempted a revolution in the family system; the point is that no one in this country hailed such a revolution as a sign of progress. It was rather denounced as a clumsy fabrication of the enemies of radical movements. Certain other possibilities which loomed large at one time or another soon disappeared below the horizon. War babies and official polygamy no longer threaten. It may well seem that the family has emerged from this war safe from violent overthrow or from organized attack.

In this country, moreover, we have no such directly destructive influence as the war has exerted in those countries which have borne the burden of the struggle. "How young your soldiers are!" was the exclamation in France as our boys passed to the front. The French armies were no longer young. The generation just coming upon the stage of action in 1914, as well as those who had just begun their family life, had almost to a man gone on, or else had returned as cripples and invalids to undertake as best they could a broken and patched existence. "In England," Mrs. Mary McArthur Anderson is reported as saying, "there are no marriages now. Our young men are

dead." In this country, despite the gold star which is found here and there upon the service flag, our homes as a mass are not directly destroyed. There is little change in the balance between the sexes.

Further, the direct effect of war upon the families of soldiers in this country is bound to be less than in Europe. Mr. Galsworthy, in a recent lecture upon the new factors in the society of the future, named as the first the difference in attitude between men who have been in the war and those who have not. Something as yet undefined, a certain disturbance of all values, a certain shaking loose from older foundations and an uncertainty as to things once settled, which as yet cannot be precisely described or estimated, marks the men who for four years have lived away from home and native land and have been led to measure many things with a different standard. Our boys have many of them been in the army for two years, but most of them have been out of the country but a short year; during much of this time they have been thinking more of home than of the world events; they are still in essence much as they were. Most of them have but one thought when discharged, which is to get off their uniform and get into civilian clothes where the sergeants cease from troubling, and saluting is no more.

But it would be hasty to assume that because war and revolution do not assail the family structure directly such an upheaval in civilization can pass without effect upon even the most ancient and stable institutions in the social order. Anything that affects health, disease, and housing, birth, marriage, or death, the work of women or education of children, the distribution of wealth and property, the drift from country to city, the standards of living in different social groups and classes, the political status of women and their place in industry, the stability of manners and morals, is bound to affect family life. It is the indirect effects of war that have most decisively affected the family in the past. Changes in form from polygamy to monogamy or from patriarchal dominance to democratic equality

have never come as a direct result of a battle or a campaign. They come rather as the slow cumulative effect of changes in work, in power, in wealth, in class, and in general moral attitude as men continually build and rebuild their civilization.

I

First of all, is the war likely to produce any effect upon the human stock itself? For we should be foolish to fix attention purely upon the problem of making the best use of our materials but never taking thought as to the quality of the materials with which we work. Is there any likelihood of increase in either the eugenic or dysgenic factors for the race? From this point of view increase in birth rate or death rate or marriage rate is of less importance than the selective character of these changes. That the birth rate in the country as a whole should fall or rise, that the death rate of babies should be lowered, that marriages generally should take place earlier or later might mean a great deal to the immediate happiness of the persons concerned, but would mean little as to the improvement or deterioration of the national stock or as to the prospects of future generations.

The important question is, in what sort of families will more or less children be brought up? It is a matter of common knowledge that the birth rate varies almost directly in proportion to poverty and inversely as to education. It is not necessary to be hopelessly conceited or bourgeois in one's outlook to suppose that people who are anxious to get an education and do get an education are on the whole a decent sort. It even seems possible to admit, with all due allowance for the predatory character attributed to the successful classes in the financial world and with all respect for the virtues of the poor, that the more vigorous, reliable, and industrious types do make their way up a little in the scale. And the very interesting point has been made by Major Leonard Darwin recently that if, as the result of the war and of the progress of democ-

racy, we make progress also in social justice—that is, in rewarding ability and usefulness more accurately than at present, and giving less of this world's goods to those who merely inherit from ancestors or have merely pecuniary ability—we are likely to be confronted with this paradox: Our genuinely superior stocks will less and less reproduce themselves. Unless some change is effected in the relative birth rates of the more and the less successful classes in society, of the better educated and the less educated, we shall more and more be having the children in the race from the less desirable stock.

This decrease in birth rate in certain classes is due partly to the postponement of marriage, partly to the voluntary limitation of families. Any attempt to deal with the situation must, therefore, consider either making it possible for the particular classes to marry earlier, or offering encouragement for larger families, or limiting the families of other groups either by raising their educational and economic level, or by encouraging direct control of the birth rate.

It is the latter group with which the social worker has most direct contact. It is the problem of the large family poorly housed, poorly fed, living in unhealthful or at least depressing surroundings, with small ambition and little knowledge or responsibility on the part of the parents, which weighs most upon her sympathies and her conscience. With this group it may well be that half measures are as good as none or even worse. Heretofore we have relied upon half measures. We have made only a beginning in segregating feeble-minded women during child-bearing age. This is the first step, even though a small one, and no state in the country can hold up its head or talk about teaching patriotism or preparedness or any of the other watchwords made current in the war, until it has taken this step. In Illinois I am thankful to say we have the legislative basis for commitment well established, and we are proceeding toward adequate administrative provision to take care of the many feeble-minded that should be segregated.

But we have been half-hearted also as regards both methods of dealing with the large families in the poorer group which are not of unsound stock. We have neither put them on their feet nor allowed them to starve. We have neither put them in good houses nor left them with none. We have legally forbidden instruction as to limitation of births although everyone assumes that such information is a matter of common knowledge among all educated people and many who are not educated. Whether we can, as the economists tell us, abolish poverty or not, certain it is that we have not yet thought it worth while to try with a tithe of the seriousness with which we have attempted to abolish autocracy in Europe. We have undoubtedly had certain very unfavorable conditions for making a fair trial. We have been receiving an enormous number of immigrants who have, in so far as they were willing workers, contributed toward abolishing poverty for some of the rest of us, but have not been equally successful in many cases in abolishing their own. We have kept our let-alone policies for wage rates and the conduct of industry which were natural under pioneer conditions and have largely ignored the changed conditions of modern industrialism. During the war we began to think nationally about certain questions. We began to see that to have good health, to produce wheat, to economize fats and sugar, were matters not of private concern but of national safety. Is it not time to begin to think nationally of the matter of poverty? Is it not time for a country which boasts of its great resources, which has discovered the presence of an army of experts willing to aid the nation in its chemistry, its physics, its agriculture, to begin to consider it also a national affair to ask as to the sources of its future generations? Is not poverty, as well as wealth and production and shipping and transportation, a national matter?

The birth rate falls in a class which aspires to a high standard, but has a small income. The class with whom the birth rate is now too low falls into two groups: country dwellers and city dwellers. The country dweller is likely

to find himself for a time at least in more comfortable conditions. The farmer has been having his chance. For him there is not likely to be any pressure that will tend immediately to lower the birth rate further.

Clerks and professional classes have high standards of living with low incomes. Notoriously the salaries of these classes have not advanced in proportion to the cost of living. Like city dwellers in general they marry later than country dwellers. Postponement of marriage in this group is likely to increase. Voluntary limitation of families is likely to go further. The difficulty of securing any domestic help is, to say the least, not an encouragement to the weary mother. The wife of one of my colleagues advertised for a maid and was cheered by a ring at the doorbell. Negotiations seemed to be proceeding until the question of children was reached. My friend admitted two. "I think," said the applicant, "I would rather take a position in a regular family." "A regular family?" queried my puzzled friend, who was not conscious of having done anything irregular. "Yes, a regular family—just husband and wife." Such regular families are undoubtedly favored by many city conditions, and for those with whom caution outruns impulse or for those who prefer other satisfactions to those of children, the tendency to regularity may become increasingly strong. For despite the strength of natural impulses, they are repressed by our civilization for so long a period that it is small wonder if at last they cease to function.

As over against these tendencies, two possibilities of improvement may be set. In a confidential report gathered by Professor Cattell as to families of scientists, health was given as a reason for limitation in more cases than was the economic or prudential factor. The war has directed our attention to the health of young men and it seems not too much to expect that we shall be interested not merely in the health of the possible future soldier but as well in the health of the future mother. Perhaps we need something like the draft-board examinations to direct attention to

the health of future mothers. With the conditions of city life and of schools which furnish an environment so totally different from that in which the race has developed, and with only a beginning of measures to offset these fundamental changes in condition, it is evident that in this, as with poverty, we have thus far taken only half-way measures.

The other suggestion of improvement which the war has brought is that of a change in our principle of taxation which shall encourage instead of discourage the birth and education of children in professional and medium income groups. Our government has made a very small exemption for each child in reckoning the income tax. This is a small beginning, but it may be welcome as a first step. Previous national taxation had been largely in the opposite direction. It imposed taxes upon consumption. The man with the large family must not merely pay all the expenses of the children; he must pay into the national treasury two, three, four or five times as much as the unmarried man or the man with a "regular" family.

One suggestion is offered by Mr. Whetham of Cambridge, England, which may not have a wide applicability, but I will pass it on. Mr. Whetham comments upon the fact that in the professional and middle classes it has been rather the custom to urge prudence upon young people and to advise them not to marry until able to provide comfortably for the household. He urges that parents and the older generation in general transfer their thought rather toward making it possible for the younger generation to marry earlier. Instead of holding on to business or professional resources until death, let, wherever possible, enough aid be given to the young people to enable them to begin their married life before the courage and passion of youth are beginning to pass. A woman from whose wisdom I have often profited has long insisted that the system of things is fundamentally wrong at this point. When people are young and in the full tide of their capacities for enjoyment, when life can make appeal

to all the avenues of sense and feeling, the limitation of income shuts the doors of expansion and compels ascetic denial as rigorously as did ever the vow of chastity, poverty and obedience. In middle life the efforts of years and the increased income give us the means, but then we have too often lost the impulse and the zest to respond to the call of joy and adventure. I am certain that as regards the teaching profession this is a sound doctrine. The young instructor in college and university, the young teacher in schools, must either have no family or must choose between children and practically all other satisfactions. I was once looking over some "model tenements" of two, three, and four rooms. "How large a family," I asked the janitor, "do you ordinarily have in the four-room apartments?" "Not so large," he said, "as in the two- or three-room apartments, for if they have several children they can't afford a four-room apartment." The same parable holds for other things than apartments. I believe that children are the best investment for young people. They are practically indispensable for the proper moral training of their parents, not to mention other joys and satisfactions, but it ought not to be necessary for the parents to forego all other good things. In any case, whatever we may say as to the "ought" of the matter, the actual fact is that of the people in these groups, many of them choose to forego the children.

II

Let us glance now at the effect of war upon the family status, not as regards the stock but as regards the conditions produced by economic, political, social and religious forces.

Five lines of influence stand out conspicuously: first, the establishment of new standards of public health, particularly with regard to the health of children and to venereal disease; second, the establishment of national prohibition; third, changes in standards of living, including wages, hours, and housing; fourth, the greater entrance

of women into industry and responsible public service; fifth, the drive toward equality.

The movement for greater care of the health of children was a natural outcome of the terrible devastation of war and of the lowering of the birth rate in those European countries which had been longest exposed to war's effects. It is unnecessary to dwell upon this point before the Conference of Social Work. Our National Children's Bureau has properly taken the lead in setting on foot measures that will mean a higher standard of infant welfare. To measure and weigh babies is of course only a first step, but it is the most difficult and important step in every reform to get some kind of standards established toward which we can reasonably work.

Far reaching in its possibilities, not merely for good health but for the happiness and morals of the family, is the new attitude toward venereal disease, which has been forced upon the nation by military necessity. Prior to this war we have had so small an army that the effect of army standards upon the general attitude of the community has been negligible. The tradition in the army has been that sex indulgence is necessary for men who are away from ordinary associations and occupations and shut up to a life of strict discipline with no home environment. The mobilization upon the Mexican border served the valuable purpose of illustrating what this theory meant, when vice interests took advantage of it to provide opportunities for indulgence. The experience of European armies as to the reduction of fighting strength by sexual immorality reinforced the moral argument that a revolution in the program was necessary if our army was to be efficient and if the morale of American women at home was to be sustained. To send their sons into an organization which maintained the old military attitude was more than could be asked of the women of this generation, even though the appeal came from the highest and holiest of causes. The vigorous campaign waged in this country and in France by the Commission on Training Camp Activities, the

National War Work Council of the Young Men's Christian Association, and other agencies, has in the opinion of military authorities had a great direct effect upon the attitude of the army. In the opinion of Dr. Exner, it has produced the cleanest army the world has ever seen, in freedom from the venereal diseases; it has all but disposed of the question of "a sexual necessity." But aside from these results of immediate bearing upon the army—results which would doubtless have been still greater had army officers not so frequently taken the attitude in speaking to their men of "Do as I say and not as I do"—more permanent and significant effects of the movement are, according to Dr. Exner:

(1) It has greatly advanced the movement for the conquest of gonorrhea and syphilis; (2) it has brought about a new and significant public attitude toward the special problems of sex, an attitude of readiness to discuss these problems frankly and to deal with them constructively; (3) it has dealt the death blow to segregated or tolerated prostitution in America; (4) it has largely broken down the prejudice against sex education; (5) it has committed our government to a policy and program and secured appropriations of adequate funds for dealing with the social problems of sex in aggressive and constructive fashion.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the possibilities in this change in general public attitude. Some have been critical of the disposition of the medical service of the government to feature prophylaxis rather than to insist upon absolute continence. But when I think of the enormous saving in the health of innocent wives and children which would be brought about by conquest of these diseases, I am disposed rather to let the medical people work in every conceivable way for the prevention and cure of disease and to rely upon other agencies for the very different task of moral education. I believe that we have in the past made entirely too much use of venereal disease as a moral agent. It has too often played the part which hell played in the religion and morality of the past generations. Probably few are now deterred from wrong-doing

by the fear of hell; yet on the whole I do not discover that the morality of the community is noticeably lower by this change in belief. Other motives have come in to take the place of fear. Is it not likely also that the actual deterrent effect of fear of disease has been much exaggerated? If this were operative anywhere it might be assumed to operate in the case of women leading a life of prostitution. But a woman who had talked with hundreds of prostitutes in an effort to understand their psychology and find out as much as possible about their attitude, told me that so far as she could discover the fear of disease played almost no rôle whatever with them. They supposed that others did occasionally contract disease if they were not careful, but they feared nothing for themselves—and this despite the fact that many of them were shown by medical tests to be infected. If we can by any means diminish disease, let us do it, and at the same time let us take advantage of the new public attitude and see what can be done by education, by wholesome recreation, by removal of public temptation, by encouraging early marriage, and by a better and more sympathetic study of the actual motives in human conduct. The old methods of suppression, repression, silence, and fear, have worked very ill. We can at least give the new policy a fair trial.

Closely related to this matter of public health is the new national policy of prohibition of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages. In a recent suggestive article by Floyd Dell in the "Liberator," the writer holds that the most important aspect of the changes to be expected is sexual. "Women hate alcohol," he says, "not so much because their husbands sometimes come home drunk as because it keeps them away from home so successfully." "Alcohol is truly the enemy of womankind; it competes with them all too successfully for what they know belongs to them, man's leisure hours, which should be their mutual play time." And for yet another reason why alcohol is an enemy of women, Mr. Dell says "the uglinesses of prostitution are so gross that the young and unspoiled

part of each male generation is only able to view them through an alcoholic haze. The hucksters of the underworld do well to mourn the passing of alcohol; for without that pink mosquito netting of illusion to spread over its rotten fruit, who will buy?" Mr. Dell points out, however, that if men and women spend their play time together, this will not necessarily ensure a happy home. "For if a man has been able to put up with a home only on the absentee plan, he will hardly bear its unmitigated wretchedness; and so with women."

In the case of prohibition, as in that of sex morality, it goes without saying that negative and repressive action will not get far alone. To open up new ways of enjoyment in which the whole family can share is a pressing problem. The moving picture theaters have probably been the greatest single agency in this direction. When I occasionally visit one of these to see what millions of my fellow citizens are doing every evening, I see a great many families going together. The saloon in this country has never been what similar institutions have been in Europe, a family gathering place. Doubtless shrewd purveyors of amusement will devise still other means of entertainment, but social workers and public agencies should press vigorously the campaign for parks and playgrounds and all sorts of outdoor and indoor instruction and entertainment. In my own city an Art Institute and a Museum attract not merely "high-brows" but a great stream of all sorts and conditions. Some take away much, others probably a little, but it is an inspiration to see how many respond to what might seem a rather limited appeal.

The third point at which the war will touch family life will be through its influence upon the standard of living and the cost of maintaining the family in health and vigor and with some regard at least to the decencies and conveniences which mean so much for the smooth conduct of living together. No one can know precisely what is to come. The enormous amounts of capital goods which have been destroyed during the war will lay a heavy

burden upon industry for their replacement. Great wars in the past have usually been followed sooner or later by periods of distress. For many years after the great Napoleonic wars the condition of the laboring classes in Great Britain was bad, despite the great increase in production which the power of steam and the new machinery made possible.

Two problems now confront the world. Can our total production be so increased by greater economy and efficiency as to reduce the burden, and in the second place, who is to carry what must be carried? Although the first of these is probably the more important, the second is more fruitful in unrest and a sense of injustice. The burdens of this war have thus far been laid to a higher degree than usual upon the well-to-do. The graduated income tax, the larger income tax for larger incomes, ought to stay. Taxes upon luxuries ought to stay. A headline in the morning paper a few days since read, "Rush bills to lift tax burdens." This looked well, but the next line read, "Plan speedy repeal of the levies on luxuries." I believe in keeping the taxes upon luxuries instead of shifting the burden to necessities. It is unthinkable that we should go back in principle to the older methods of taxing the consumer for the principal part of national burdens. An important factor is, no doubt, the resolute attitude taken by organized labor that wages shall not be reduced. Employers are disposed to acquiesce in this policy and to pass on to the consumer the charges necessary to maintain high wages. Those labor groups which have a strategic position have undoubtedly benefited at the expense of other groups. Nevertheless the very fact that many families have gained a glimpse of larger incomes, of a higher standard of family life, is bound to help in preventing the laborer from carrying so much for his share as he has had to carry after wars in the past.

Yet we cannot improve the condition of all laborers to anything like a desirable standard if we give to labor all the profits now going to capital and the salaries now going

to management. We cannot (as a mechanic recently maintained in conversation) "give five thousand dollar salaries to every one" so long as the country is only producing about one thousand dollars; but if labor and capital share hardships there will be more energetic efforts put forward to increase production and improve the condition of all. An engineering friend tells me that high wages are a great stimulus to the invention of labor saving machinery. How far can the nation move forward to a new plane of greater production? One of my economic colleagues is inclined to doubt whether our national production at present is more than 5 per cent efficient. Our wastes in agriculture by bad soil, poor methods, by pests of various sorts; our wastes in coal mining and coal burning; our labor turnover, our strikes, our absurdly expensive distribution of milk and groceries, would go far to substantiate such an estimate. Yet this same colleague believes that we have gained a conviction that production is a national enterprise and not a matter for private profit. If both employers and wage workers can get this point of view, and if the wage worker can be protected so as to receive his share of increased production, a most important step toward family comfort in large will be taken.

The fourth line of effect of the war upon the family which I shall mention is that which relates to the greater employment of women in industry and other out-of-the-home occupations.

As has frequently been noted, the interests of the middle-class woman and of the factory worker or those who come from the less well-to-do families, are not the same. The middle-class woman on the whole probably needs more outlet for her activity and would be better off with more definite work. The opening of new occupations is distinctly welcome to her. At the time of our Civil War, we are told by Mr. Arthur Calhoun in his recent work on the *Social History of the Family in America*, there was a great entrance upon many new occupations on the part of women. And on the whole they have remained in possession of

many of the fields which they occupied at that time. It is likely that as a result of our present war women will continue to fill many of the places which they have been found so capable of filling. Is this to be loss or gain for the family? If it means that more women are to be childless, or if it means that no distinction is made between mothers or prospective mothers and those who are not in either class, the result is bound to be bad. Instead of talking about the employment of women as a class, is it not the more hopeful line to concentrate public attention upon the problem of the mother and prospective mother? Is it not one of the next lines of attack to make sure that every woman shall have that free period and suitable care for the birth of her child, and that attention after, which has already been secured in other countries? And then further that the mother with young children shall be given the opportunity to be at home and to care for them?

I cannot feel that the present indiscriminate raid of industry upon women regardless of family ties can be justified. I am not sure but that the statisticians would find it more destructive than war to the life and health of children and to the morale of family life.

The influence which in the long run may well prove greatest of all is the great drive of the war toward equality between men and women—equality in work, in wages, in political rights, in social responsibilities, in authority in the home. Not that the war initiated these things, but it speeded up the movement already started in this direction. To have more occupations open to women means power; to enter into organized industry and get training through labor unions in leadership and co-operation means power; to manage war campaigns of all sorts means power. What will be the effect of this new power and this new education of woman upon the family? Will it tend toward any wiser mating? Will it tend to increase still further the divorce rate which for many years has been mounting steadily? Probably the effects will be mixed. Education in all these various lines, and the greater freedom and

power of woman will probably make on the whole for more careful choosing of a mate. But it is not likely for a time at least to lessen the frequency of divorce. For since three-fourths of the divorces are sought by women, divorce seems to be largely a matter of what a woman will put up with. If she has more power, she is likely to be less tolerant. For it is true in domestic life as in industry that democracy is far more delicate and difficult to manage than is autocracy. This is not to say that it is hopeless. The rate of divorce in the country as a whole is now about one divorce for nine marriages. In the group that I know best it is about one for a hundred. I do not think this is because the college professor is less exasperating, or the college professor's wife less of an equal. I incline to think it is because she is somewhat more cautious in her original selection and more philosophical afterwards—that is, that she views large and small with better perspective, for the courts tell us that it is more often the small than the large that wrecks marriage.

But whether divorces increase or decrease, the movement toward equality can no more be blocked than the tide. And it ought not to be if it could. If the family were committed to the older type, it would remain only at the cost of a perpetual conflict between impulse on the one hand and certain well-considered goods on the other, between social duty on the one hand and self-respecting life on the other, between parental affection and other almost equally imperious demands. It is because the family not only satisfies passion, but sublimates it; because it not only involves sacrifice, but on the other hand opens up new fields of thought and emotion, action and living, that it will keep its place in genuine democratic development. For democracy means co-operation, and the family is not only the oldest, but in many ways by far the finest type of co-operation.

Yet none of these gains for the family is greatest. The greatest is the hope and the deep resolve that war itself shall cease.

The Greek story of Agamemnon which told of the warrior disregarding family ties for military necessity, disregarding family morals under military thrill of power, and finally after his victories falling himself a victim to the passions of maternal love and conjugal jealousy, suggests in its outcome the issue of the duel between war and the family. War has disregarded the family under plea of higher necessity; it has habitually trampled upon many of the family sanctities; it has lowered birth rates and loosened marriage ties; it has often quenched in death the family life so happily begun. But now, what lies behind the insistent and compelling demand in all countries that this war shall be the last? What gives its deepest urge to that demand for a league of nations and for international co-operation and justice, which the peoples of the world have so deeply felt? Not, I take it, so much that war is expensive, or irrational, or risky. Is it not chiefly just this: That the family at last rises to avenge itself upon its ancient enemy and destroy it? This time, the first possibly in history, there is the chance that the family, like Wordsworth's Happy Warrior, may turn its "necessity to glorious gain."

PHOTOMOUNT
PAMPHLET BINDER
PAT. NO.
877188
Manufactured by
GAYLORD BROS. Inc.
Syracuse, N. Y.
Stockton, Calif.

Date Due

Ja 8 [illegible]			
[illegible]			

HQ535 .T91
Wartime gains for the American family,
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00025 4294